

REMARKS

[0005] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1-6, 9-16, 19, 20, 23-27, 30, 32-34, 36-38, 40, 42, and 46-59 are currently pending
- Claims 1, 3, 9, 23, 30, 32, 34, 46, 50, 51, 55, and 56 are amended herein

[0006] Support for the amendments is found at least in Figures 1, 2, 7, and 8, and in the specification at least at page 1, line 22 – page 2, line 18; and page 4, lines 3-16.

Allowed Claims

[0007] The Office indicates that claims 9-16, 19, and 20 are allowed. Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for allowing claims 9-16, 19, and 20. Claim 9 is amended herein to correct a minor typographical error. Otherwise, these claims have not been amended herein, and therefore remain in condition for allowance.

Cited Documents

[0008] The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- **Oetzel:** Oetzel et al., U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0175159
- **McGrath:** McGrath et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,925,474
- **Kelly:** Kelly et al., U.S. Patent Application No. 2006/0150228
- **Yang:** Yang et al., U.S. Patent No. 6701478

Claims 1-6, 9-16, 20, 23-27, 30, 32-34, 36-38, 40, 42, and 46-59 Are Non-Obvious Over Oetzel in view of McGrath and Kelly

[0009] Claims 1-6, 9-16, 20, 23-27, 30, 32-34, 36-38, 40, 42, and 46-59 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Oetzel in view of McGrath, and further in view of Kelly. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

[0010] Claims 2, 9-16, 20, 33, and 42 are not addressed specifically in the Office Action with reference to this rejection. However, claims 2 and 33 are addressed with reference to separate rejections. Furthermore, claims 9-16 and 20 are indicated allowable. Claims 28 and 44 are addressed in the rejection – however, claims 28 and 44 were previously canceled, and are no longer pending in the application.

[0011] Accordingly, Applicant herein addresses claims 1, 3-6, 23-27, 30, 32, 34, 36-38, 40, and 46-59 with regard to this rejection. Claims 2 and 33 are addressed with regard to separate rejections below.

[0012] Claim 42 has not been addressed by the Office.

Independent Claim 1

[0013] Based on the discussion during the above-referenced interview with the Examiner, claim 1 is amended herein to further highlight distinctions between “the computing system” and “the remote database” of claim 1. Furthermore, Applicant submits that the Office has not made a *prima facie* showing that independent claim 1 is obvious in view of the combination of the combination of Oetzel, McGrath, and Kelly. Applicant submits that the combination of Oetzel, McGrath, and Kelly does not teach or suggest the following features of this claim (with emphasis added):

...

re-opening the media content that is stored on the DVD at a later time; and

retrieving the DVD metadata directly **from the local media library**,
based on the DVD ID, **without searching the database**.

[0014] As stated in the Office Action, “Neither Oetzel nor McGrath disclose re-opening the media content that is stored on the DVD at a later time; and retrieving the DVD metadata directly from the local media library, based on the DVD ID, without searching the database.” (Office Action, page 4.) The Office Action cites Kelly, paragraph [0018] as teaching this feature.

[0015] Kelly describes maintaining locally, an ID that can be used each time the DVD is opened, to access web-based data associated with the DVD. However, the data is not itself stored locally. This is further emphasized by the last sentence in the rejection of claim 1, which states, “Consequently, the ordinary skilled artisan, would have been motivated to combine the cited references since Kelly’s teaching would enable web storage (See Kelly abstract.)”

[0016] Claim 1 is directed to a local media library – **not** *web* storage. Accordingly, the combination of Oetzel, McGrath, and Kelly does not teach or suggest the claimed, “retrieving the DVD metadata directly from the local media library, based on the DVD ID, without searching the database.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 3-6

[0017] Claims 3-6 ultimately depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is patentable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 3-6 are also patentable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from a patentable base claim. These claims may also be patentable for the additional features that each recites.

Independent Claims 23, 30, 32, 46, 50, and 55

[0018] Based on the discussion during the above-referenced interview with the Examiner, amendments similar to those presented herein for claim 1 are presented herein for claims 23, 30, 32, 46, 50, and 55. Furthermore, Applicant submits that the Office has not made a *prima facie* showing that independent claims 23, 30, 32, 46, 50, and 55 are obvious in view of the combination of the combination of Oetzel, McGrath, and Kelly. Applicant submits that the combination of Oetzel, McGrath, and Kelly does not teach or suggest the following features of these claims (with emphasis added):

- Claim 23:

receiving via the user interface, user-submitted DVD metadata; and
storing the user-submitted DVD metadata in a local media library maintained in non-volatile memory local to the computing device and separate from the DVD, such that the user-submitted DVD metadata is maintained in association with the DVD ID even if the DVD is no longer accessible by the computing device, and such that the user-submitted DVD metadata is retrieved from the **local** media library when the media content that is stored on the DVD is re-opened at a later time.

- Claim 30:

re-opening the media content that is stored on the DVD at a later time; and
retrieving the user-modified DVD metadata from the **local** media library based on the DVD ID.

- Claim 32:

maintaining the DVD metadata that is displayed in a local media library maintained in non-volatile memory that is local to the computing device, separate from the data repository of DVD metadata, and separate from the DVD, such that the DVD metadata is associated with the DVD ID, and such that the DVD metadata is retrieved directly from the **local** media library based on the DVD ID when the DVD is opened at a later time.

- Claim 46:

a Wizard UI configured to enable a user to select DVD metadata to be associated with the media content, the DVD metadata to be stored in the media library, such that the DVD metadata is automatically retrieved directly from the media library anytime the media content is opened.

- Claim 50:

means for automatically retrieving the DVD metadata directly from the media library when the media content is opened.

- Claim 55:

associating at least a portion of the metadata that is returned with the DVD in a media library maintained in non-volatile memory local to the computer system and separate from the DVD, such that the at least a portion of the metadata is automatically retrieved from the media library when the media content stored on the DVD is opened, without performing a network search.

[0019] Claims 23, 30, 32, 46, 50, and 55 recite elements that are similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 1. Furthermore, the Office provides the same rationale for rejecting claims 23, 30, 32, 46, 50, and 55 as is provided for rejecting claim 1. Accordingly, for reasons similar to those presented above with reference to claim 1, Applicant submits that the combination of Oetzel, McGrath, and Kelly does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of these claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 24-27, 34, 36-38, 40, 42, 47-49, 51-54, and 56-59

[0020] Claims 24-27, 34, 36-38, 40, 42, 47-49, 51-54, and 56-59 ultimately depend from one of independent claim 23, 32, 46, 50, and 55. As discussed above, claims 23, 32, 46, 50, and 55 are patentable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 24-27,

34, 36-38, 40, 42, 47-49, 51-54, and 56-59 are also patentable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from a patentable base claim. These claims may also be patentable for the additional features that each recites.

Claim 2 Is Non-Obvious Over Oetzel, McGrath, Kelly, and Yang

[0021] Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Oetzel in view of McGrath and Kelly, and further in view of Yang. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dependent Claim 2

[0022] Claim 2 depends from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is patentable over the cited documents. Therefore, dependent claim 2 is also patentable over the cited documents of record for at least its dependency on a patentable base claim. Additionally, this claim may also be patentable for the additional features that it recites.

Claim 33 Is Non-Obvious Over Oetzel, McGrath, and Yang

[0023] Claim 33 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Oetzel in view of McGrath, and further in view of Yang. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dependent Claim 33

[0024] Claim 33 depends from independent claim 32. As discussed above, claim 32 is patentable over the cited documents. Therefore, dependent claim 33 is also

patentable over the cited documents of record for at least its dependency on a patentable base claim. Additionally, this claim may also be patentable for the additional features that it recites.

Conclusion

[0025] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/Kayla D. Brant #46,576/
Kayla D. Brant
(kayla@leehayes.com; 509-944-4742)
Registration No. 46576

Dated: March 17, 2009